# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GREENBERG TRAURIG, P.A.; GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP	: :
v.	: Civil Action : No.: 12-cv-6718-MSG
FRANCINE GRIESING	· : :
	ORDER
AND NOW this day of	of, upon consideration of Francine
Griesing's Motion for Leave to Supplementary	nent the Record, it is hereby ORDERED that
Respondent's Motion is GRANTED and that	at the Court will take judicial notice of the Amended
Class Action Complaint filed in Francine Fri	iedman Griesing v. Greenberg Traurig, LLP, No. 12-
cv-8734 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 15, 2013).	
ī	Mitchell S. Goldberg, J.
J	Milchen S. Ouldberg, J.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GREENBERG TRAURIG, P.A.;

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

Civil Action

No.: 12-cv-6718-MSG v.

FRANCINE GRIESING

#### FRANCINE GRIESING'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD

Francine Griesing, by and through her counsel, respectfully moves this Court for an order granting leave to supplement the record in this matter with an Amended Class Action Complaint Ms. Griesing filed in a related matter in the Southern District of New York. Francine Friedman Griesing v. Greenberg Traurig, LLP, No. 12-cv-8734 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 15, 2013) (attached as Exhibit A). The grounds for this Motion are more fully stated in the accompanying Memorandum.

#### Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kate Mueting

David W. Sanford (DC Bar No. 457933) Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice forthcoming Katherine M. Kimpel (DC Bar No. 493028) Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice forthcoming Kate Mueting (DC Bar No. 988177) Admitted Pro Hac Vice SANFORD HEISLER, LLP 1666 Connecticut Ave, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20009 Telephone: (202) 499-5200 Facsimile: (202) 742-7776

NEIL J. HAMBURG JODI S. WILENZIK ID Nos. 32175 and 89205 Hamburg & Golden, P.C. 1601 Market Street, Suite 3310 Philadelphia, PA 19103-1443 (215) 255-8590 (phone) (215) 255-8583 (fax) hamburgnj@hamburg-golden.com wilenzikjs@hamburg-golden.com

Counsel for Francine Griesing

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GREENBERG TRAURIG, P.A.;

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

Civil Action

v.

No.: 12-cv-6718-MSG

:

FRANCINE GRIESING

## FRANCINE GRIESING'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD

Francine Griesing hereby moves for leave to supplement the record in this matter with an Amended Complaint Ms. Griesing filed in a related matter in the Southern District of New York. See Amended Class Action Complaint, Francine Friedman Griesing v. Greenberg Traurig, LLP, No. 12-cv-8734 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 15, 2013) (attached as Exhibit A). Through her Amended Class Action Complaint, Ms. Griesing places before the Southern District of New York the issue of whether her claims, and the claims of the class action and collective action plaintiffs, are subject to arbitration. See id. "Class, Collective and Individual Count I," ¶¶ 241-28. As such, the Amended Class Action Complaint undermines the assertion of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP (collectively "GT") that the issue of whether Ms. Griesing's claims are subject to arbitration cannot be heard in or decided by a court in the Southern District of New York. See generally Petitioners' Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss or For Change of Venue, Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Greenberg Traurig LLP v. Francine Griesing, No. 12-cv-6718, Dkt. 13 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 21, 2012).

As Ms. Griesing has asserted, GT could have, but chose not to, seek relief in the Southern District of New York under the Federal Arbitration Act § 3, 9 U.S.C. § 3. See generally, e.g.,

Francine Griesing's Reply to Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss or, Alternatively, For a Change of Venue Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), *Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Greenberg Traurig LLP v. Francine Griesing*, No. 12-cv-6718, Dkt. No. 15-1 (E.D. Pa. Jan 4, 2013). The Southern District of New York is the appropriate and proper district in which to litigate all of the issues in this matter. Consistent with that position, Ms. Griesing amended her Southern District of New York Class Action Complaint to raise in that district the issue of whether her claims are subject to arbitration.

In the Amended Class Action Complaint, Ms. Griesing, on behalf of herself, the Class, and all Collective Action Plaintiffs under the Equal Protection Act, "seeks declaratory relief, pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, because an actual and justiciable controversy has arisen and now exists between Ms. Griesing and GT as to whether any of her claims must be resolved by arbitration rather than by a jury in this Court." Exhibit A ¶ 228. The Amended Class Action Complaint also alleges that "[a] judicial determination is necessary and appropriate at this time to determine the respective rights and obligations of the Parties with respect to arbitration of Ms. Griesing's claims." *Id*.

Ms. Griesing respectfully requests that this Court take judicial notice of the Amended Class Action Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201. The Amended Class Action Complaint is a proper subject of judicial notice under this Rule, which provides that a "court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it . . . can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2); *see also McTernan v. City of York*, 577 F.3d 521, 526 (3d Cir. 2009) ("In

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ms. Griesing also amended her Complaint to state that she received from the EEOC her Right to Sue letter on January 11, 2013. *See* Exhibit A  $\P$  22.

addition to the complaint itself, the court can review documents attached to the complaint and

matters of public record . . . . ").

Additionally, Rule 201 provides that this Court must take judicial notice of the Amended

Class Action Complaint because Ms. Griesing has requested it and has supplied the Court with a

copy, attached as Exhibit A. See Fed. R. Evid. 201(c) ("The court (1) may take judicial notice on

its own; or (2) must take judicial notice if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the

necessary information." (emphasis added)).

Therefore, Ms. Griesing respectfully requests that this Court take judicial notice of the

Amended Class Action Complaint filed in the related action in the Southern District of New

York.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kate Mueting

David W. Sanford (DC Bar No. 457933)

Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice forthcoming

Katherine M. Kimpel (DC Bar No. 493028)

Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice forthcoming

Kate Mueting (DC Bar No. 988177)

Admitted Pro Hac Vice

SANFORD HEISLER, LLP

1666 Connecticut Ave, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20009

Telephone: (202) 499-5200

Facsimile: (202) 742-7776

NEIL J. HAMBURG

JODI S. WILENZIK

ID Nos. 32175 and 89205

Hamburg & Golden, P.C.

1601 Market Street, Suite 3310

Philadelphia, PA 19103-1443

(215) 255-8590 (phone)

(215) 255-8583 (fax)

hamburgnj@hamburg-golden.com

wilenzikjs@hamburg-golden.com

Counsel for Francine Griesing

3

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing and its attachments to be electronically filed with the United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and notice will be served by operation of the Court's Electronic Case Filing System on representatives of all parties to this litigation as follows:

Scott Bennett Freemann Freemann Law Offices, P.C. One Logan Square, Suite 2675 18th & Cherry Streets Philadelphia, PA 19103 sbf@freemannlaw.com

William H. Jeffress, Jr., Esquire Baker Botts LLP 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. The Warner Washington, DC 20004-2400 william.jeffress@bakerbotts.com

Bettina B. Plevan, Esq. Proskauer LLP 11 Times Square New York, NY 10036-8299 bplevan@proskauer.com

January 16, 2013

/s/ Harrison Stark